

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 8 and 9. In particular, FIGS. 8 and 9 have been amended to add the legend "Prior Art."

Attachment: Amended FIGS. 8 and 9

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, as amended, are pending in this application. In this response, Applicants have amended certain claims to clarify some of the features of the present invention. In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents. As no new matter has been added, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments at this time.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to FIG. 8 of the drawings because it failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "40a-40d" and "400a-400d" have both been used to designate the LAN switch from FIG. 8. In addition, FIGS. 8 and 9 were objected to because the Examiner believes they should be designated by a legend, such as "Prior Art," because only that which is old is illustrated.

In response, Applicants have amended the written description to change the references to "40a-40d" to correctly state "400a-400d." Moreover, the legend "Prior Art" has been added to FIGS. 8 and 9 as suggested by the Examiner. In light of these amendments, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been overcome.

THE OBJECTIONS TO THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

At pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the written description because of various formalities. As shown above, Applicants have amended the written description in the manner suggested by the Examiner in order to overcome these objections. With regard to the objection to the written description at page 15, line 5, Applicants note that line 5 does not include the number "51a," and thus Applicants have not amended written description in the manner suggested by the Examiner in section h. As such, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

THE OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 2 because the letter "a" needs to be inserted before the word "SONET" on line 13 of claim 2. As shown above, however,

Applicants have amended claim 2 to remote the language objected to by the Examiner. In light of these amendments, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objections to the claims has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 because the phrase "opposite each other" and the phrase "oppose each other" in claim 3 purportedly render the claim vague and indefinite. As shown above, however, Applicants have amended claim 3 to remove the recitation of "oppose each other." As such, Applicants submit that the Examiner's § 112 rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 4-14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0056017 to Gonda ("Gonda") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0110087 to Zelig *et al.* ("Zelig"). In addition, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gonda and Zelig, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0176450 to Kong *et al.* ("Kong"). Claim 3 was also rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,031,324 to Goody ("Goody") in view of Gonda and Zelig. Finally, claim 4 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Goody, Gonda, Zelig, and Kong. Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections have been traversed for at least the reasons that follow.

Gonda discloses a method and apparatus for translating SDH/SONET frames to Ethernet frames. In particular, Gonda discloses a translation engine that includes a buffer for holding SDH/SONET and Ethernet frames. An Ethernet Media Access Control address for a corresponding SDH/SONET TDM slot is also provided. Additionally, a translation engine is provided to translate SDH/SONET frames into Ethernet frames in communication with an output interface. The SDH/SONET payload is sent through a translation engine to translate the SDH/SONET payload into an Ethernet payload.

The second reference cited by the Examiner is Zelig, which discloses a method for establishing a data link service connection for bi-directional service to be provided between two nodes on a network. A local index is generated responsive to a request to initiate a service

connection, and a first signaling message is sent to the second node containing the index from the first node and service parameters of both of the nodes. Upon receiving the message at the second node, the service connection is initiated responsive to the index and the service parameters. A second signaling message is sent to the first node, and the service indicated by the index is activated.

To cure the deficiencies of Gonda and Zelig, the Examiner cited Kong, which generally relates to an interface for an optical node with a plurality of input and output ports in a SONET/SDH optical network that is connected to a plurality of virtual concatenation channels. The interface has a plurality of input ports for taking Ethernet signals as inputs, and a plurality of output ports for selectively outputting Ethernet frames in the Ethernet signals to the virtual concatenation channels.

Finally, the Examiner cited Goody, which discloses a LAN/WAN switch that aggregates LAN traffic onto SONET/SDH transport streams in a programmable manner. The system can concentrate Ethernet packets and map the data onto SONET streams at data rates varying from STS-1 to STS-12C. Depending on the bandwidth available in the WAN interface, different numbers and combinations of STS-n streams can be formed.

As shown above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that one embodiment of the present invention includes a multiplexing part that establishes a filtering part that passes through Ethernet frames having a specific VLAN identifier among a plurality of Ethernet frames and a first encapsulating part that encapsulates information data contained in an Ethernet frame that passes through a filtering part. Gonda, Zelig, Kong, and Goody are all silent with regard to this aspect of the present invention.

Moreover, independent claim 4 has been amended, as shown above, to clarify that one embodiment of the present invention includes a first SONET multiplex isolation device multiplexing part that inserts a flag that indicates an input side Ethernet frame transmission fault along with the second SONET multiplex isolation device isolation part that prevents output of an Ethernet frame that is transmitted by detection of the flag from a frame originating in the SONET frame. Gonda, Zelig, Kong, and Goody are also silent with regard to this aspect of the present invention.

At least in light of the differences set forth above, and in view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants submit that the Examiner's § 103 rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments and remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith extending the time for response three months to and including May 1, 2008. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any other fees be due, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-4545, Order No. 19546.0034.

Respectfully submitted,
HANIFY & KING, P.C.

Dated: May 13, 2008

By: *Siddhesh V. Pandit*

Siddhesh V. Pandit, Registration No. 58,572
HANIFY & KING, P.C.
1875 K Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 403-2104 Telephone
(202) 429-4380 Facsimile